



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/082,860	10/19/2001	Arnaud Bourge	PHFR 010027	4949

24737 7590 06/03/2005

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

AN, SHAWN S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2613

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/082,860	Applicant(s) BOURGE ET AL.	
	Examiner Shawn S. An	Art Unit 2613	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 13 May 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
 Claim(s) allowed: 1,6-8 and 12-15.
 Claim(s) objected to: _____.
 Claim(s) rejected: 4,5,10 and 11.
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
 13. ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: regarding claims 4-5 and 10-11, as previously discussed in the last Office action, Zhu discloses prediction unit (Fig. 10, 48) for predicting a transformed MC signal (59), and being situated between the encoder and decoder, wherein the filter circuit is a filter (136) for receiving the transformed MC signal and the first transformed signal (42), and delivering a filtered transformed signal to the Q circuit (78).

Zhu does not particularly disclose a spatial filter for receiving the first transformed signal and for producing a filtered transformed signal.

However, Cheung et al discloses a decoder comprising a spatial filter (Fig. 1, 140) for receiving a first transformed signal (115) and producing a filtered transformed signal (OUTPUT).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art employing a device/method for transcoding an encoded signal into a secondary encoded signal as taught by Zhu to replace the filter with the Cheung et al's spatial filter in such a way that the spatial filter receive the first transformed signal and produce the filtered transformed signal, thereby the filtered transformed signal and the transformed MC signals are delivered to the Q circuit as an alternative arrangement for improving the quality of video signals.

Claims 5 and 11 are substantially the similar as claims 4 and 10, with the exception of an inverse filter for inverse filtering filtered signal.

However, Cassereau et al teaches a motion picture coding apparatus comprising an inverse filter (Fig. 1, 20) for inverse filtering filtered signal.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art employing a device/method for transcoding an encoded signal into a secondary encoded signal as taught by Zhu to replace the filter with the Cheung et al's spatial filter in such a way that the spatial filter receive the first transformed signal and produce the filtered transformed signal, and incorporate the Cassereau et al's inverse filter, thereby the filtered transformed signal and the transformed MC signals are delivered to the Q circuit as well as the inverse filtering in the motion predicting stage as an alternative arrangement for improving the quality of video signals.

Note: the claimed limitations that are supported by the secondary references (Cheung et al and Cassereau et al) are conventionally well known knowledge generally available to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

Henceforth, in response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the Examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).



SHAWN AN
PRIMARY EXAMINER